

REMARKS

Claims 1-74 were pending prior to the above amendments. Claims 2, 4, 8-9 and 63 are canceled. Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 10-13, 17-19, 30, 36, 39, 43, 52, 59-62, 64-65 and 67 are amended to more particular point out and distinctly claim Applicants' invention.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 12-16, 18-21, 23-24, 28-29, 33, 36, 40-42, 44, 47-51, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61-62, 66, 68 and 71-74 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,587,789 ("van Diggelen").

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection. As amended, Applicants' Claim 1 recites:

1. (Currently amended) A positioning information distribution system comprising:

an information processing station connected to and accessible via a data network, said information processing station having a database for storing navigation information regarding satellites in a positioning system;

a plurality of receiving stations each including a positioning system receiver and a transmitter, said positioning system receiver receiving navigational messages from one or more of said satellites in said positioning system and transmitting said navigation information extracted from the navigational messages to said information processing station via a data link for storage at said database; and

a mobile unit including a positioning system receiver and a data processing unit, said mobile unit receiving positioning signals from a subset of satellites being in line-of-sight of said mobile unit and communicating with said data network using wireless communication, wherein said data processing unit processes said positioning signals and said navigation information obtained from said information processing station over said data network to compute a measured

position of said mobile unit.

Such an architecture for a positional information distribution system is neither disclosed nor suggested by van Diggelen. For example, van Diggelen's central processing site 108 is directly connected to the mobile receivers by communication link 120 (See, for example, van Diggelen at col. 3, lines 44-52). By contrast, Applicants' information is accessible via a data network, which is accessible without requiring a direct communication link between it and any of the mobile unit. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 and dependent Claims 3, 5-7, 12-16, 18-21, 23-24, 28-29 and 33 are each allowable over van Diggelen. For substantially the same reasons, Claim 36 and dependent Claims 40-42, 44, 47-51, 53,-55, 57 and Claim 59 and dependent Claims 61-62, 66, 68 and 71-74 are each allowable over van Diggelen. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 12-16, 18-21, 23-24, 28-29, 33, 36, 40-42, 44, 47-51, 53,-55, 57, 59, 61-62, 66, 68 and 71-74 are therefore requested.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 12-16, 18-21, 23-24, 28-42, 44, 47-51, 53-55, 57, 59, 61-62, 68, and 71-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by PCT publication WO 99/56144 ("Sheynblat I"). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection. As amended, Applicants' Claim 1 recites:

1. (Currently amended) A positioning information distribution system comprising:

an information processing station connected to and accessible via a data network, said information processing station having a database for storing navigation information regarding satellites in a positioning system;

a plurality of receiving stations each including a positioning system receiver and a transmitter, said positioning system receiver receiving navigational messages from one or more of said satellites in said

positioning system and transmitting said navigation information extracted from the navigational messages to said information processing station via a data link for storage at said database; and

a mobile unit including a positioning system receiver and a data processing unit, said mobile unit receiving positioning signals from a subset of satellites being in line-of-sight of said mobile unit and communicating with said data network using wireless communication, wherein said data processing unit processes said positioning signals and said navigation information obtained from said information processing station over said data network to compute a measured position of said mobile unit.

Such an architecture for a positional information distribution system is neither disclosed nor suggested by Sheynblat I. For example, Sheynblat I discloses that location servers 32 and 33 computes the measured position of a mobile unit using pseudoranges provided by the mobile unit (See, Sheynblat I, pp. 11-12). By contrast, the measured position of the mobile unit is computed in the mobile unit using the received positioning signals and the navigation information retrieved over the data network from the information processing station. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 and dependent Claims 3, 5-7, 12-16, 18-21, 23-24, 28-29 and 33 are each allowable over Sheynblat I. For substantially the same reasons, Claim 36 and dependent Claims 40-42, 44, 47-51, 53,-55, 57 and Claim 59 and dependent Claims 61-62, 66, 68 and 71-74 are each allowable over Sheynblat I. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 12-16, 18-21, 23-24, 28-29, 33, 36, 40-42, 44, 47-51, 53,-55, 57, 59, 61-62, 66, 68 and 71-74 are therefore requested.

The Examiner rejected Claims 2, 4, 8, 17, 25-27, 38-39, 43, 52, 60, 65, and 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Diggelen in view of U.S. Patent 6,222,4873 ("Twitchell"), the Examiner citing Twitchell for teaching triangulation not taught in van Diggelen. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection. As each of

Claims 17 and 25-27 depend from Claim 1, the combined teachings of van Diggelen and Twitchell under the Examiner's construction neither disclose nor suggest the architecture for a positioning information distribution system of Claim 1, as discussed above. Thus, Claims 17 and 25-27 are each allowable over the combined teachings of van Diggelen and Twitchell. Similarly, Claims 38-39, 43 and 52, each depending from Claim 36, and Claims 60, 65 and 67, each depending from Claim 59, are each allowable over the combined teachings of van Diggelen and Twitchell. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 17, 25-27, 38-39, 43, 52, 60, 65, and 67 are therefore requested.

The Examiner rejected Claims 2, 4, 8, 17, 25-27, 38-39, 43, 52, 60, 65, and 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheynblat I in view of Twitchell, the Examiner citing Twitchell for teaching triangulation not taught in Sheynblat I. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection. As each of Claims 17 and 25-27 depend from Claim 1, the combined teachings of Sheynblat I and Twitchell under the Examiner's construction neither disclose nor suggest the architecture for a positioning information distribution system of Claim 1, as discussed above. Thus, Claims 17 and 25-27 are each allowable over the combined teachings of Sheynblat I and Twitchell. Similarly, Claims 38-39, 43 and 52, each depending from Claim 36, and Claims 60, 65 and 67, each depending from Claim 59, are each allowable over the combined teachings of Sheynblat I and Twitchell. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 17, 25-27, 38-39, 43, 52, 60, 65, and 67 are therefore requested.

The Examiner rejected Claims 10-11, 45-46, and 69-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Diggelen in view of U.S. Patent 6,583,756 ("Sheynblat II"), the Examiner citing Sheynblat II for teaching satellite health information not taught in van Diggelen. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner rejection. Each of Claims 10-11, 45-46 and 69-70 depends from one of Claims 1, 36 and 59, and thus are allowable over van

Diggelen for the reasons stated above. Thus, Claims 10-11, 45-46 and 69-70 are each allowable over the combined teachings of van Diggelen and Sheynblat II. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 10-11, 45-46 and 69-70 are therefore requested.

The Examiner rejected Claims 10-11, 45-46, and 69-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheynblat I in view of Sheynblat II, the Examiner citing Sheynblat II for teaching satellite health information not taught in Sheynblat I. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner rejection. Each of Claims 10-11, 45-46 and 69-70 depends from one of Claims 1, 36 and 59, and thus are allowable over Sheynblat I for the reasons stated above. Thus, Claims 10-11, 45-46 and 69-70 are each allowable over the combined teachings of Sheynblat I and Sheynblat II. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 10-11, 45-46 and 69-70 are therefore requested.


The Examiner rejected Claims 37 and 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Diggelen, the Examiner Diggelen as teaching the receiving stations receiving GPS satellite information from 28 satellites in earth's orbit. Because Claims 37 and 64 depend from Claims 36 and 59, respectively, each of Claims 37 and 64 are allowable over van Diggelen for the reasons already stated above with respect to Claims 36 and 59. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 37 and 64 are therefore requested.

The Examiner rejected Claims 22 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Diggelen, even though van Diggelen does not teach the use of a T1 link for the data link. The Examiner instead takes official notice that a T1 link is a landline. Because Claims 22 and 56 depend from Claims 1 and 36, respectively, each of Claims 22 and 56 are allowable over van Diggelen for the reasons already stated above with respect to Claims 1 and 36. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 22 and 56 are therefore requested.

The Examiner rejected Claims 22 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheynblat I, even though Sheynblat I does not teach the use of a T1 link for the data link. The Examiner instead takes official notice that a T1 link is a landline. Because Claims 22 and 56 depend from Claims 1 and 36, respectively, each of Claims 22 and 56 are allowable over Sheynblat I for the reasons already stated above with respect to Claims 1 and 36. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 22 and 56 are therefore requested.

Therefore, Applicant submits that all pending claims (i.e., Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10-62 and 64-74) are each allowable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicants at 408-392-9250.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on March 24, 2004.




Attorney for Applicant(s)

3/24/2004

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,


Edward C. Kwok
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 33,938